UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/666,621                           | 09/19/2003  | Chungtang Tang       | 200209305-1         | 9230             |
|                                      | 7590 03/18/200<br>CKARD COMPANY                                     | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD |   |                      | BLAIR, DOUGLAS B    |                  |
|                                      | INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION<br>FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400 |                      |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                      |   |                      | 2142                |                  |
|                                      |   |                      |                     |                  |
|                                      |   |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                      |   |                      | 03/18/2008          | ELECTRONIC       |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

| Office Action Summary  |  | Application  | lication No. Applicant(s)  |  |             |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|
|  |  | 10/666,62  | <u>.</u> 1   | TANG ET AL.  | TANG ET AL. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Examiner   |  | Art Unit   |             |  |  |  |
|  |  | DOUGLAS  | S B. BLAIR   | 2142   |             |  |  |  |
| The MAILING<br>Period for Reply  | DATE of this communication   | on appears on the  | cover sheet with   | h the correspondence a   | ddress      |  |  |  |
| WHICHEVER IS LOI  - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS fror  - If NO period for reply is sp.  - Failure to reply within the s Any reply received by the 6  | ATUTORY PERIOD FOR INGER, FROM THE MAIL! available under the provisions of 37 on the mailing date of this communicated above, the maximum statutory et or extended period for reply will, by office later than three months after the nent. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | NG DATE OF TH<br>CFR 1.136(a). In no evention.<br>period will apply and will<br>y statute, cause the app | IIS COMMUNIC,<br>ent, however, may a rep<br>II expire SIX (6) MONT<br>lication to become ABA | ATION. ply be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this of the control of th |             |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to   | communication(s) filed on  | 30 Sentember 2   | 2003   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>F</b>  |  | This action is n   |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| <b>'</b>   | <i>'</i> —   | _  |  | rs prosecution as to th  | e merits is |  |  |  |
| ,  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  | ·  | •  | •  | ,  |             |  |  |  |
| <u> </u>   | s/are pending in the applic  | cation   |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| · · · ·  | Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
|  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
|  | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
|  | _ is/are objected to.  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| ·  | _ is/aire objected to.<br>are subject to restriction ai  | ad/or alaction rea   | uiromont   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 0)[2] Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> (   | are subject to restriction at  | nd/or election req   | ullement.  |  |             |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| •  | on is objected to by the Ex  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C  | . § 119  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some coll None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |
|  | Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-<br>statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  | 48)  | Paper No(s)  | ımmary (PTO-413)<br>/Mail Date<br>formal Patent Application<br>_·  |             |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/666,621 Page 2

Art Unit: 2142

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-16 and 23-25, drawn to methods and a node for implementing a method for searching through a map to identify nodes for routing purposes in a region of an overlay network, classified in class 709, subclass 238.

II. Claims 17-22, drawn to nodes in an overlay network which store proximity information, classified in class 709, subclass 223.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the system of claim 17 does not require the particular method of identifying a close by node or nodes as claimed in invention I. The subcombination has separate utility such as being able to be implemented in any a overlay architecture, not limited to that of Invention II.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable

in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include

(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an

election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,621 Page 5

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/ Examiner, Art Unit 2142